



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

44
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/014,893	10/29/2001	Eduard K. de Jong	P-6992	2395
24209	7590	08/15/2006		EXAMINER
		GUNNISON MCKAY & HODGSON, LLP		BATES, KEVIN T
		1900 GARDEN ROAD		
		SUITE 220	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		MONTEREY, CA 93940		2155

DATE MAILED: 08/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/014,893	DE JONG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kevin Bates	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8-1-06.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on June 13, 2006.

The Information Disclosure Statement has been received on August 1, 2006 and has been considered.

The Drawings have been received on July 17, 2006.

Claims 1-6 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reiche (6092196) in view of Rode (6970904).

Regarding claims 1, 3, and 5, Reiche teaches a method for controlling user access to distributed resources on a data communications network (Column 8, lines 9 – 13), the method comprising:

receiving a resource request, said resource request including a rights key credential (Column 9, lines 38 – 42), said rights key credential comprising:

at least one key to provide access to a resource on said data communications network (Column 9, lines 3 – 5); and a resource identifier (Column 9, lines 45 – 46), said resource identifier comprising a resource server peer group ID and a user ID (Column 8, lines 65 – 66), said resource server peer group ID identifying a resource server peer

group (Column 10, lines 50 – 63), said resource server peer group comprising at least one server that maintains a mapping between a user ID and said at least one key (Column 8, line 64 – Column 9, line 6; Column 10, lines 39 – 49); and providing access to said resource using said at least one key (Column 9, lines 63 – 66).

Reiche does not explicitly indicate that the user ID is a randomized user ID.

Rode teaches a system for controlling access to system resources (Abstract) that includes a unique identifier for the user as taught in Reiche, but further teaches that the identifier can be a uniformly chosen random number (Column 2, lines 45 – 54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Rode's teaching of choosing a random number for the unique identifier in order to allow an identifier be chosen without contain any personal information about the user, allowing the system to keep the user anonymous.

Regarding claims 2, 4, and 6, Reiche teaches a method for controlling user access to distributed resources on a data communications network (Column 8, lines 9 – 13), the method comprising: receiving a resource request, said resource request including a rights key credential (Column 9, lines 38 – 42), said rights key credential comprising: at least one key to provide access to a resource on said data communications network (Column 9, lines 3 – 5) each of said at least one resource stored on a separate secure device (Figure 1, elements 120 and 150); and a resource identifier (Column 9, lines 45 – 46), said resource identifier comprising a resource server peer group ID and a user ID (Column 8, lines 65 – 66), said resource server peer

group ID identifying a resource server peer group (Column 10, lines 50 – 63), said resource server peer group comprising at least one server that maintains a mapping between a user ID and said at least one key (Column 10, lines 39 – 49); and providing access to said resource using said at least one key (Column 9, lines 63 – 66).

Reiche does not explicitly indicate that the user ID is a randomized user ID.

Rode teaches a system for controlling access to system resources (Abstract) that includes a unique identifier for the user as taught in Reiche, but further teaches that the identifier can be a uniformly chosen random number (Column 2, lines 45 – 54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Rode's teaching of choosing a random number for the unique identifier in order to allow an identifier be chosen without contain any personal information about the user, allowing the system to keep the user anonymous.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed June 13, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that the reference, Reiche, does not disclose a resource request, a rights key credential, a resource identifier, and a server peer group ID.

The examiner disagrees, according to paragraph 237 and Figure 46A of the instant application, the resource request is a URL command from the client to a server, rights key credential is part of that URL and the resource server peer group ID is also part of the URL request. Reiche teaches an authentication system that allows a client

to make a request to a server using a URL (Column 8, lines 47 – 49) this is a uniform resource location, meaning a request for a identified resource. As part of this URL request is the address of an authentication program on the customer server (Column 8, lines 47 – 52; Column 9, lines 57 – 63) since this is a URL request, as part of any URL is the server domain as see in Figure 46A where the Some Resource Server Peer Group, for examiner in www.uspto.gov, uspto.gov would be considered the resource server peer group ID as defined in the specification of the instant application which has to be present in all URL requests. Reiche discloses a URL request to a customer server, this server is the resource server peer group and the URL has an ID to point to it (Column 8, lines 47 – 49). Further, Reiche teaches using a encrypted simple private key to authenticate a user (Column 9, lines 1 – 6) which is passed in the HTTP header (Column 9, lines 53 – 56) which is also how the rights key credential is used in the instant application as seen in Figure 46B. Reich teaches an authentication server as part of its server peer group (Column 8, lines 49 – 52) where the authentication server maps the user ID to the Resource Server Peer Group ID which as stated is the URL (Column 10, lines 51 – 63). So all the limitations of the intention are covered by the reference Reiche.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Bates whose telephone number is (571) 272-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KB

KB
August 9, 2006



SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER